

disgraceful. I think it is shameful. How do we look those Americans in the eye who are struggling to feed their kids, who do not have work, and we tell them that we have a solution to the problem?

What is the solution? I do not believe it is adopting the President's leave-no-millionaire-behind plan. Ever since this President has taken office, we have said we are going to cut taxes. We have a recession, we are going to cut taxes; the economy is down, we are going to cut taxes; you want to go to war, we are going to cut taxes; if tuition goes up, we are going to cut taxes; if health care goes up, we need to cut taxes; and if schools are cutting the year short because they cannot afford to educate their kids, we are going to cut taxes.

We hear a lot, Madam Speaker, about compassionate conservatism, when it seems the only thing being conserved in the United States Capitol is compassion.

I do not understand what is compassionate for the 8.8 million unemployed people in this country. To me, leaving them hanging is cruel. I do not understand what is compassionate for the 80,000 workers who are exhausting their unemployment benefits every week. To me, Madam Speaker, that is cruel. And I do not understand what is compassionate for the 360,000 Ohioans who cannot find a job. I think it is cruel. I do not think it is compassionate.

During our country's last major recession, in the early 1990s, Congress kept the extended unemployment benefits program in place for 27 months; 27 months. Earlier this year, we had to beg and plead just to get the current program extended to 15 months, and the unemployment problem is worse today than it was then.

I must say, Madam Speaker, what I really have a problem with and what I am really not understanding, there was an article today in the Washington Post, and it talked about deflation and how the Fed and the policy advisers of the Federal Reserve are starting now to worry seriously about deflation. They are saying that there are too many goods in the marketplace, there is too much labor in the marketplace, and the prices are going to be driven down because of the oversupply.

There are three job seekers for every job opening. This is one of the worst labor markets since the Great Depression, and we have too many goods, and we have too many workers, too much supply, and the answer is to go back to the supply-side economics of the 1980s.

We have enough supply. We do not need to cut taxes for the wealthiest people. We need demand-side economics, and the greatest stimulus that we can give is to extend these unemployment benefits.

One study says that each dollar spent on unemployment benefits would boost the economy by \$1.73. We need people to buy products. There are enough products trying to be sold. If you cut

taxes for the top 1 percent, they are not going to produce anything, because there are enough goods already in the marketplace.

We need to take care of the 2 million people and the 36,500 Ohioans, give the money to them, let them feed their families, let them clothe their families, and let them stimulate the economy. We have tried the supply-side economics once in the 1980s. It did not work. We ran tremendous deficits. We increased the burden on future generations. What we need to do is put the money in the pockets of the people who need it, average, middle-class Americans.

Again, Madam Speaker, this is voodoo economics, it is smoke and mirrors, it is bait and switch, and it does not work, and I do not think we should try it again.

□ 1700

CONGRESS SHOULD EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS IMMEDIATELY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today to call on this Congress to pass an extension of unemployment benefits immediately. Just listen to the unemployment numbers from labor market areas in my congressional district; they are glaring: 30 percent in the Millinocket and East Millinocket area, 13 percent in Calais, 12 percent in Jonesport-Millbridge, 11 percent in Dexter-Pittsfield, 11 percent in Machias-Eastport.

The fact is behind those figures are real people and real families, and they go to bed every night with the uncertainty that hangs over their beds.

As a mill worker in northern Maine myself for nearly 30 years, I know the stories of those who have lost their jobs. I know the people. They are my neighbors, they are my friends, they are my relatives. They are the very men and women whose hard work fueled a decade of economic expansion, which they barely enjoyed, and they have now become the victims of a fallen economy.

The Federal Government reported that 8.8 million Americans are out of work and that our country's unemployment has risen to 6 percent. Over the past 2 years, the economy has lost over 2.7 million private sector jobs, and our economy has suffered a net loss, on average, of more than 74,000 jobs a month.

In Maine, over the last 8 years, we have lost over 22,000 manufacturing jobs alone from companies like Georgia-Pacific to Dexter Shoes to Fraser Paper Company to Great Northern Paper Company to Hathaway Shirts to Foster Manufacturing, just to name a few. Almost every week my office re-

ceives news of yet another company that has shut its doors or has laid off people.

By the end of May, over 2,700 workers in Maine will have exhausted their benefits, and 10,600 workers in Maine could be helped by an extension, not to mention the nearly 4 million jobless Americans.

How can this Congress turn its back on them?

An extension would also do much more than provide just aid. At a time when we are trying to get this economy moving again, putting money in the hands of people who will spend it on consumption is one of the best investments that we can make.

According to an independent research group, each dollar devoted to UI extension would boost the economy by \$1.73. By contrast, each dollar that is connected with the tax reduction dividends would boost the economy by just 9 cents. I think the choice is very clear.

But, despite these facts, last Friday this House passed a so-called recovery plan that is centered around reducing taxes on capital gains and dividends. Madam Speaker, 94 percent of the people in my district will get an average tax cut totaling only \$52 from the cuts on capital gains and dividend taxes. How will that plan put money in their hands to spend and consume so they can stimulate the economy? How will this help get them jobs?

After nearly 30 years working in a paper mill, I know what working people need, and the bill that was passed last Friday will not help working people at all. It will not help the people in Millinocket, Jonesport, Dexter or Bangor.

By contrast, an alternative plan that I supported would actually deliver billions of new tax relief. It would give incentives so companies will hire the long-term unemployed, it would deliver \$44 billion in aid to struggling States like Maine, and it would also extend unemployment assistance to those struggling to find a job. This would deliver over 1.1 million new jobs.

We could do all of this in 10 years at zero cost, nothing; no additional budget deficits, no more borrowing from Social Security. This is the best course for the State of Maine. This is the best course for America.

So let us take the first step, and that first step is we must pass an unemployment insurance extension today so those areas with high unemployment such as 30 percent unemployment in the Millinocket area will be able to benefit and get the economy moving again.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

BUSH JOBS AND GROWTH PACKAGE PROMISES RECOVERY FOR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed by the revisionist history that continues to accompany these arguments against the jobs and growth package. We continue to hear the accusations that the President's 2001 economic plan has not worked. Against what benchmark are we evaluating the success of this policy?

President Bush inherited a speculative bubble that had burst into the Clinton-Gore recession when this body first passed that plan. September 11, of course, worsened our economic outlook even more dramatically. What was the result, then, of the President's 2001 economic plan? A potential depression became one of the shortest recessions on record.

Now the economy is growing again, but the American people continue to fear for their own economic security and for the dreams they nurture for their children and their grandchildren. The recovery remains sluggish because the temporary nature of the 2001 tax cuts has restrained businesses from fully returning to an investment and growth mode. An unpredictable and ever-changing Federal tax policy is inimical to the long-term, predictable model that businesses require. Thus, this year's jobs and growth package finishes the job that President Bush and Congress started in 2001.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush's plan to revitalize our economy is rooted in values instead of expediency. It reflects the belief and the genius of the American people instead of the power of government. It follows the principle that the American people are better than Washington bureaucrats when it comes to creating jobs and wealth.

John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan understood the power of this idea. They featured tax cuts as the centerpiece of their economic agenda, launching two of the longest economic booms in American history. When Ronald Reagan inherited a shattered economy wracked by double-digit inflation, 20 percent interest rates, long gas lines, and stagnant productivity, he turned the conventional economic wisdom on its head. At the time, the so-called experts told us that high inflation was a necessary evil of a growing economy. They also said that the Reagan tax cut plan would not fix the economy; it would only worsen inflation. They were wrong.

President Reagan once quipped that when a friend of his was asked to a costume ball, he slapped some egg on his face and went as a liberal economist.

President Bush's plan will rescue us from the economic morass the last ad-

ministration left behind, just as Ronald Reagan's visionary leadership accomplished more than 20 years ago.

The jobs and growth package the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has proposed includes all of the President's priorities, including the acceleration of individual rate cuts, marriage penalty relief, an increase in the child care tax credit, and a dividend cut. It also includes a capital gains tax cut that our economy desperately needs. Balancing the budget remains a very important objective, and growing the economy while controlling spending is the best way I know how to achieve that goal. I am concerned about deficits, but I am much more concerned about making certain that Americans have jobs.

The Federal Government's tax revenues increased after the 1981 Reagan tax cuts. The deficits of the 1980s occurred because spending increased at a more rapid pace than revenue. Thus, we must keep spending in check.

This legislation will provide immediate stimulus to the economy and to the stock market, creating more jobs and opportunity. Moreover, this bill will produce the prosperity over the long term, providing desperately needed tax relief for every American who pays our bills.

HEAVY-HANDED GOP PARTISANSHIP CAUSES SHUT-DOWN IN TEXAS LEGISLATURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, there is a very important event occurring in the State of Oklahoma right now. Fifty-one very brave, patriotic Texans are in Ardmore, Oklahoma, and they are there for a reason. They are there to protest the heavy-handed actions by Washington political leaders in trying to impose a new set of congressional districts on the State of Texas.

Now, redistricting is done every 10 years. It was done 2 years ago in Texas. That is not good enough for some people here in Washington. They want to require the State of Texas to do it again, even though the plan that was implemented 2 years ago was specifically approved by the U.S. Supreme Court.

So these 51 brave Texans have traveled to Ardmore, Oklahoma, to deny a quorum to the Texas Legislature. They are prepared to return immediately if the Speaker of the State House will simply say, we are not going to do redistricting. We did that. It was done 2 years ago. We do not need to do it again. They are prepared to come back and vote on all of the important pending measures before the State House that are important for the State of Texas. They will vote to change procedural rules to permit important bills to come up; everything except redistricting.

So the business of the State of Texas can go forward if the Speaker will simply say, yes, we do not have to do redistricting again. We are not going to be forced to do redistricting by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the people from Washington. It was done 2 years ago; it does not need to be done again right now, simply for political reasons.

I would like to read to the House, Mr. Speaker, a number of editorials around the State. Almost every leading newspaper in the State, almost every newspaper has sided with these brave, patriotic Texans and against the power grab by Washington Republicans. Let me start with the Waco Tribune: "Speaker Craddick has no one to blame but himself. He helped write history when he was one of 30 members of the Texas House who disappeared during the 1971 legislative session. Craddick and his 'Dirty Thirty' colleagues were protesting the heavy-handed actions of then House Speaker Gus Mutscher and his cronies who were involved in the Sharpstown bribery-conspiracy scandal. What Craddick has done is put his friendship with U.S. House Majority Leader TOM DELAY over the lessons of history and his own promises to run a bipartisan house."

The Dallas Morning News: "House Speaker Tom Craddick can halt the work stoppage in Austin. Mr. Craddick should resist pressure from Congress to contaminate a generations-old, census-based exercise by converting it into an ill-considered, purely partisan power grab. He should commit to leave Texas' political boundaries alone, and protesting Democrats should promptly return to the hive."

The Houston Chronicle: "... if they believe their principles are worth fighting for, and they have only one means to fight for them, it's difficult to fault them for it. Particularly in a fight that was thrust upon them by Washington-driven partisan politics. At the very least, Republicans pushing the redistricting effort bear a large share of the responsibility for this legislative standstill. We and many others have been saying since before the session began that Texas has too many important pieces of business to conduct to get bogged down in a needlessly partisan and divisive political and legal catfight over redistricting."

The Austin American-Statesman: "It's sad that it came to this, but the Speaker has been tested and found wanting on a number of issues. The one that sent the quorum-busters towards the exits was the grossly partisan congressional redistricting bill and how Craddick let it advance in the hasty, backroom way that it did. . . . The villain in the Democrats' statement is not Craddick, but U.S. House Majority Leader TOM DELAY of Sugar Land, an extremely partisan Republican who wants more members of his party elected to the U.S. House from Texas. . . . Refusing to show up for a legislative session is a desperate measure, and the